DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 766 IR 000 480

AUTHOR West, Martha W.; Butler, Brett E.
TITLE Microreadings; Easing Obstacles to Library Distribution of Information.
INSTITUTION San Jose State Univ., Calif. Dept. of Librarianship.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Copyrights; Costs; *Graduate Students; Library Circulation; Library Schools; *Microfiche; Microform Readers; *Reading Assignments; *Student Attitudes; University Libraries; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Reserve Book Collections

ABSTRACT

In an effort to deal with some of the problems of a "reserve book room" in a university library, a study was conducted by the Department of Librarianship at San Jose State University of the feasibility of providing students with their required course readings in microfiche format. One section of the students in the basic survey course, Foundations of Librarianship, used microfiche copies of their assigned readings, the other two sections obtained the same readings in the reserve book room as usual. At semester end, an anonymous questionnaire was distributed to the class. Although sample size and study limitations precluded drawing firm conclusions, results indicated that reaction to the microreadings was positive by all concerned; the microfiche were felt to be preferable to the reserve book system. Problems noted were the availability of microfiche readers and the technical difficulties and costs of the microfilming process and of obtaining copyright release from publishers. The appendix to this report contains the survey questionnaire and response data, the course syllabus, and the correspondence involved in obtaining copyright clearance. (SL)

ED 089766

# MICROREADINGS

## Easing Obstacles to Library Distribution of Information

Martha W. West and Brett B. Butler
Department of Librarianship, San Jose State University
and Butler Associates

March 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION OR-
IGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 000 480

There is continuing concern among librarians regarding the role of the academic library in the support of rapidly expanding continuing and decentralized education programs. This paper describes the conceptual design and initial actual test of an operating mechanism which could allow the library to expand its traditional resource roles to match the trends demonstrated by new education programs.

1. The 'readings' problem. Over the past few decades, the library's traditional resources and support for higher education curriculum has been rather easy to describe. The general collection supports independent and advanced research. The student's textbook provides the basic reference and learning tool for the class. And the instructor's assigned readings are held from circulation 'on reserve' in a fixed location for short-term on-site reference.

It is clear that many changes in higher education are already well established which make this information distribution system less effective than it has been traditionally. And, all indications point to continued emphasis on these new methods in the forseeable future. Major trends include:

- Continuing education which makes possible degree study for advancement or career retraining, most often to those not likely to be full-time students
- Decentralized education providing access through telecommunications, mail study, or remote academic centers to those not able to travel to a major campus center
- Individual instruction emphasizing tailoring course reading and achievement requirements to student needs and interests

- Primary material study stressing access by students to basic literature or materials under study in contrast to secondary packagings of information about the subject to be studied

- Information obsolescence requiring more frequent updating of most curriculum subjects, thus making investments in specific materials difficult

In addition, it is clear that the "Reserve Book Room" method of making the library's information available to a large number of users over a short period of time has, of itself, major limitations of service:

- Item access is limited by the number of copies of a book or article purchased (or copied from an original) by the library. Investment in multiple copies of an item for which continued high useage is not guaranteed is an expensive investment for the library

- Physical access is restrained since items cannot be removed from the reading area. Browsing is typically not possible in controlled reserve areas

- Geographic access is extremely constraining, requiring the student to travel to a single location to study during limited hours of access

Thus, the normal open distribution channel of the library is blocked by the high demand for short periods of time. While it is clear that only a very small percentage of the library's holdings are so blocked, it is equally clear that these materials represent a much higher potential proportion of patron use. And these are materials chosen by the faculty in direct curriculum support.

2. Study Need. The Department of Librarianship at San Jose State University, San Jose, California has a one-year graduate program leading to the M. A. in Librarianship. It has an average enrollment of approximately 250 students. Extensive readings lists used in the courses of the Department have imposed a burden on a student body which is typically commuting to class and supporting other work or family obligations.

Familarity with the attractive economics of publishing selected documents in microfiche led to an exploration of the potential for providing required readings in microform to students. Positive benefits could readily be seen, but it was clear a limited test would be necessary to gain experience with several major questions:

- Would there be student resistance to microformat rather than print format?
- What would costs and technical problems of obtaining and micropublishing readings be?
- What differences in completion of reading assignments would obtain through using microforms? Would any differences in overall learning be discernable?

An initial research proposal generated support in the form of a small faculty/student research grant from San Jose State University. This allowed development of the initial test, although not implementation of the formal experimental design and cost evaluation for wider library use. A second research proposal has been prepared for a study which would provide more extensive and rigorous data.

3. Study Limitations. Funds allowed selection and micropublishing of readings for only a single section of the basic survey course. No pretesting of the students either in the test or control sections was possible. No quantitative measurements of use of, perceived learning from, or measured achievement relevant to the readings could be accomplished. It was possible to purchase only limited viewing equipment and no experimentation on the effects of equipment upon use was possible. Cost data could be studied only in an approximate manner since volunteer help was used, and micropublishing methods for test were not those envisioned for larger-scale operation. Possible options in microform reduction ratios, presentation and packaging, and formats could not be explored.

4. Study hypotheses. The microform readings test proceeded on the exploration of the hypotheses that:

- Convenience of access to the student would be perceived as a greater benefit than the cumulative detriments of handling microforms instead of print
- Costs to the library/patron system would prove to be less than continuation of the present system
- Copyright permission could be obtained for the necessary copying and microreprinting
- Learning would be facilitated and possibly increased through increased access to learning materials

Definitive experimental results were not expected from the initial test, but guidance for future study and system development was anticipated.

5. Literature Survey. Very little experimentation in library publication of holdings on a demand basis has been reported. Grausnick[1] and Kottenstette[2] have reported results of an experimental study in which students were paid to test microform curriculum material use. Aschenborn[3] alludes briefly in an article, THE USE OF MICROFILM IN SOUTH AFRICAN LIBRARIES, to experimental development of an operating program for correspondence courses, and subsequent private correspondence[4] provided further details.

Nonpublished information has been obtained on varying uses of microforms for curriculum support at the Naval Dental School[5], the Church College of Hawaii[6], and the Worcester Polytechnic Institute[7].

While the South African reports gave generally favorable results as transmitted, they provided little real guidance for an American situation. None of the other projects discovered were analogous enough to the proposed test to provide much guidance.

In general, it seemed the microform readings test was working uncharted territory. And in fact the responses from publishers subsequently contacted for copyright release confirmed this conclusion by expressing total unfamilarity with any such concept in their history.

6. Study Methodology. A detailed readings list (Appendix B) had already been prepared for Lib 200, Foundations of Librarianship. This was a multi-section class with a relatively stable syllabus and taught regularly by the same two faculty members. This syllabus was revised so that all the readings included were required and recommended readings for which copies could not be obtained locally were eliminated. Three sections of Librarianship 200 were scheduled; one section was selected to use the test of microfiche access to the required readings. All three sections were assigned the same syllabus and readings schedule. The test section was expected to be the most initially responsive to the test. It was the late-afternoon section and typically was composed of part-time and commuter students for whom the problem of access to assigned readings was most acute.

Copyright release permission was requested via form letter and obtained for purposes of the test directly from the following publishers:

> Academic Press, American Library Association, Bantam Books, Burgess, Columbia University Press, Datamation, Duke University, Harper and Row, Indiana University Press, Libraries Unlimited, M.I.T. Press, Scarecrow Press, Special Libraries Association, University of Illinois Press, University of Washington Press, Viking Press, Wilson Library Bulletin.

After subsequent correspondence, permission was also received from:

> American Society for Information Science, Encyclopedia Britannica, Library Journal, University of Chicago Press, John Wiley, Shoe String Press.

Only the last-named publisher insisted on the payment of a nominal $20 honorarium or royalty. Several publishers expressed interesting opinions on the copyright and publishing implications of the project. The form request letter and associated publisher correspondence are attached as Appendix C.

As permissions were obtained, materials were prepared for microfilming. Because no microfilm facilities were available in the library, material was filmed at a local service bureau*. Although every effort was made to provide these materials in the original format, some were available only as photocopies; this was a limiting factor on image quality. Expected problems with acquisition of materials for filming were in fact experienced, and did result in last-minute exclusion for the fiche of some readings.

While it was hoped to photograph fiche in the order of the syllabus, because of delays in obtaining some permissions, it was necessary to film in a random sequence and insert fiche location addresses in the syllabus for location.

The limited budget and time sequence also precluded use of sophisticated packaging and presentation. The fiche were distributed loose, with no external article identification on the jackets. The preferred method would have been to follow the Microbook[8] format, with the printed syllabus and introduction bound in a single volume with visible jackets holding each fiche separately. Also, it would have been desirable to print the bibliography, fiche coordinates, and a location map on each jacket.

---

*Special thanks should go to Mr. Frank Sanchez and Applied Microfilm, Inc. of San Jose, California, for donating a great deal of volunteer time and effort to a difficult filming task.

In the actual filming process, the variation in sizes of the original pages produced the most difficulty. Some problem was experienced with photographs and colors. The fiche was produced at a nominal 24X, NMA 98-page format. Negative mode was selected arbitrarily. The complete set of readings, with some gaps on fiche to locate articles more conveniently, comprised fifteen fiche. Two portable microfiche viewers were purchased with study funds. Two tabletop viewers were available in the Department of Librarianship resource room and further available equipment on campus was located in the Library's microform reading room.

7. Study Findings. An interim interview was held with the pilot class during the semester to ensure that no major unperceived obstacles were interfering with the course of the test. In general, it was confirmed that the class was using the microform readings, and that obstacles in locating and using equipment were not unsurmountable. The most interesting unexpected information, confirmed in the final questionnaire, was that students were searching out fiche viewers in a number of other local libraries on their own initiative, and that a major part of the use of the readings was going on in these libraries.

At semester end, a survey questionnaire was distributed to solicit opinions from the class, and were returned anonymously. Cumulative results obtained are reproduced on a copy of the questionnaire in Appendix A. Both facts on useage and opinions regarding the utility of the microforms were explored; findings are grouped and discussed below.

Useage. All students used the microform readings at least ten times; 75% of the students used the microforms over twenty times. Seven of

the students also noted using printed forms of the same readings, in six different area libraries (although all students had been initially instructed to use only the microform readings supplied). Only two of the students used the libraries over twenty times; these two students also used the microforms over twenty times each.

Some students used readings in more than one location. In total, 21 reported using the San Jose library's microform room, thirteen used a total of eight other local libraries, and only six used the portable readers at home.

Time distribution of useage was about evenly divided between weekdays and weekends, and also about evenly divided among mornings, afternoons, and the evening night period. Several students mentioned the limited hours of availability of the San Jose and other area libraries as restraints on their evening use of the microforms.

As with site location, some students used more than one type of equipment during the semester. Nine reported using the portable readers, twelve reported using about ten different makes of viewers (in area libraries or at San Jose), and four identified reader-printer equipment used. No student reported use of a reader-printer to obtain printed copy*. Two-thirds of the students reported that they had "viewed once" eighty percent or more of the articles included in the microform readings. About 75% of the students reported they had "read thoroughly" sixty percent or better of the articles. No significant difference was obtained between the test class and the class using printed readings in re-ponse to this question.

---

*Although students were not forbidden to make copies, this was not suggested at the start of the test, and they were told fiche would have to be returned at the end of the semester because of copyright permission restrictions, which may have restrained copying.

Evaluation. A number of subjective questions were included to elicit the opinion of the students regarding the utility of the microform readings concept both in the test situation and with changes in costs and access which would obtain in a larger ongoing operation.

Convenience of the microreadings was rated better than the print reference system by two-thirds of the test class. Only one student rated the system "much less" convenient*. Nine students felt microforms made completion of reading assignments easier, six perceived no difference, and three felt it was more difficult.

The benefits cited as high in aggrevation by two-thirds of the class was "Viewing fatigue". Problems of high-to-average importance were "Viewing quality", "Quality of fiche copy", "Room illumination", and "Inability to see more than one page at once". It should be noted that the significant use of viewers in other libraries introduced a much broader set of variables than desired with regard to equipment quality, ambient illumination, and the like. Problems related to "Handling microforms" and "Handling equipment" were rated as problems of low significance by almost three-quarters of the test class.

Personal portable Reader. The students were asked to reconsider a number of questions regarding the actual test experiment, and estimate if they would have a changed response were they to have a personal portable reader available during the semester. They were not asked at this point to consider who was buying the reader. The proportion of evaluations reporting "somewhat" or "much better" convenience rose from 12 to 14 students.

---

*This student's response to Q. 6, evaluation of convenience if a personal portable reader had been available, was "much more" convenient, and in fact this student took the initiative to rent a fiche reader locally for a period of time.

but eliminated the "worse" or "much worse" evaluations. Completion of assignments would have been "easier" for 17 of the 18, compared to nine in the actual test situation.

Only five students had reported they read "more" articles in microform than they would have read using print resources during the test. Assuming the availability of the personal reader, eleven students estimated they would read more, and the two who had estimated reading "less" disappeared into the "about the same" category.

Projecting availability of all assigned readings in microforms, students saw little change in study habits; twelve reported their overall reading would "stay the same". Assuming the personal reader, half reported their reading would "increase". Specifically, the estimates of articles "viewed once" and "read thoroughly" increased considerably.

Costs. An effort was made to gather some information about the perceived cost-benefit of the microforms to the students as contrasted to the textbook/syllabus reserve room system. Students were asked if they would purchase microfiche readings if "available" in the bookstore at $4.00 per set. This question implied handling the fiche like a "recommended" text, one not required for purchase, so as to test the willingness of the students to pay for the conveniences perceived. Thirteen reported they would "definitely" or "probably" purchase a set of fiche in these conditions. Four reported "possibly", one "probably not" and none indicated "definitely not". The availability of (free) personal readers was not explored with respect to this question, but increased the positive response to all other evaluation questions described above.

In general, little interest was shown by students in purchasing portable viewers at present prices in the question as phrased. Ten indicated they would "definitely not" buy a $100 viewer. Ten indicated "probably" or

"definitely not" to a $50 viewer, although four indicated "definitely buy'. However, at a hypothetical $25, thirteen indicated interest, and only five remained negative. There are a number of variables which were not explored in this section which would have to be considered before drawing conclusions about use of portable viewers; for instance,

1) There was little use of the portable viewers during the test by a majority of the class; few were familar with equipment prior to the test

2) The possible utility of the machine for other classes and professional needs were not explored. A class of librarians may be more inclined toward such a purchase, for instance, because of knowledge of other micropublications

8. Conclusions. Although the size of the sample and the necessary limitations of the study preclude drawing any firm conclusions as to the proof or disproof of the study hypotheses, some generalizations can be made based on the study results. With regard to acceptance, a positive reaction to the Microreadings concept was expressed by all concerned -- students, instructors, and publishers. The extent of this can be gauged by the requests received from the control sections -- i.e., those using traditional methods of obtaining the course readings -- that they be allowed to use the microfiche also. (However, it must be noted that in spite of such verbalization, no one actually went so far as to borrow another student's set of fiche.)

Even with the specified limitations of the study, especially with regard to quality control, the overall response was that the microreadings were preferable to the present system of library use. The greatest advantage noted was that of having the readings available at all times, rather than having to use precious study time simply locating materials to be read. While some of this searching may be due to local conditions, unfavorable queuing conditions do result from increased class size and the time-span

allotted for completion of assignments. If availability of readers were equal to the availability of the fiche, there seems little doubt as to the total acceptance of the Microreadings concept. This is supported by the South African experience previously alluded to.

Two areas which require further investigation before embarking upon a much larger scale study are the technical problems assiciated with filming original material of varying quality, size, and format and the logistics (and related costs) of obtaining copyright permissions. The establishment of a Clearinghouse to handle both of these matters would do much to help this situation. In many cases, especially for periodical materials, it might be possible to obtain microform masters from the publisher at the same time that copyright permission was granted, thus immeasureably improving the quality of the fiche copies. Use of the Clearinghouse could also coordinate duplicate use of material for various courses and institutions. There appear to be no unsurmountable user or producer obstacles to a more widespread acceptance and use of the Microreadings concept. The next step is to gain further experience through extension of this study to other institutions and programs.

## References


1. Grausnick, Robert and Kottenstette, J. P. An investigation of the environment for educational microform utilization. Phase I, "Student use of classroom microform in support of a survey course." Final Phase Report. Denver University, Colorado Research Institute. April 1971.

2. Kottenstette, J. P. and Dailey, K. A. An investigation of the environment for educational microform utilization. Phase II. "Student use of classroom microform in support of a content course." Final Phase Report. Denver University, Colorado Research Institute. April 1971.

3. Aschenborn, H. J. The use of the microfilm in South African libraries. JOURNAL MICROGRAPHICS 6:33-37, Sept/Oct 1972.

4. Willemse, J. Unpublished reports.

5. Wachtel, L. W. Programmed instruction with microfiche: Introduction to the slide rule. Naval Dental School, Bethesda, Md. July 1970.

6. Personal correspondence.

7. Personal correspondence.

8. Welch, T. F. The MLS book program: meeting microforms halfway/review article. MICROFORM REVIEW 1:215-219, July 1972.

# APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

MICROREADINGS TEST QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR TEST SECTION - LIBR. 200

1. Did you use the microfiche form of the readings? YES - 18

2. If YES, how many times? 1 ___ 2-5 ___ 10-20 4 over 20 14

3. If not, did you use RBR or Library materials? NO - 12

   3a. If Library, which one? YES - SIX LIBRARIES NOTED

4. If YES, how many times? 1 2 2-5 4 10-20 0 over 20 2

5. Overall, would you say having your own microfiche copy of readings compared to using reserve or library copies, is:

   3 About the same convenience

   5 Somewhat more  7 Much more

   2 Somewhat less  1 Much less

6. If you had been able to have your own portable viewer during the semester, would your opinion be:

   3 About the same (microforms vs reserve)

   6 Somewhat better  8 Much better

   0 Somewhat worse  0 Much worse

7. If microfiche for all class readings were available in the bookstore for $4.00 per set, would you:

   7 Definitely buy a set  2 Probably not buy a set

   6 Probably buy a set  0 Definitely not buy a set

   4 Possibly buy a set

8. Indicate your attitude toward buying your own microfiche if portable viewers were also for sale at prices below:

| | $100 | $50 | $25 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Definitely buy | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| Probably buy | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Possibly buy | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Probably not | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Definitely not | 10 | 8 | 3 |

9. Where did you use the microreadings for the class?

6 SJSU Department of Librarianship

15 SJSU Library Microform room

0 SJSU other campus site

13 Other local library 8 LIBRARIES NOTED

6 Home

10. When did you use microreadings?

13 Weekdays — 12 Afternoon 1-5 p.m.

12 Weekends — 7 Evenings 6-9 p.m.

9 Morning 8-12 a.m. — 3 Nights 10 p.m. or later

11. What equipment did you use for viewing?

9 Portable (borrowed from Department of Librarianship)

0 Portable, other

12 Tabletop - Brand/Model 8 BRANDS NOTED IN ADDITION TO SJSU EQUIPMENT; SOME "DON'T KNOW"

4 Reader-Printer - Brand/Model ONE BRAND NOTED - ALSO "DON'T KNOW

12. Rate the benefits you observed using microreadings:

| | Hi | Av | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Convenience in time of use | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Convenience in place of use | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| c. Access to all readings at once | 14 | 2 | 0 |
| d. Ability to make print copy | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| e. Having a personal copy | 14 | 2 | 11 |
| f. Ability to study at home | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| g. Elimination of searching citations | 10 | 3 | 1 |

13. Rate the problems you experienced in using microreadings:

| | Hi | Av | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Handling microforms | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| b. Handling equipment | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| c. Obtaining equipment | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| d. Viewing quality | 9 | 6 | 2 |
| e. Viewing fatigue | 12 | 6 | 0 |
| f. "Positive-Negative" viewing | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| g. Quality of fiche copy | 6 | 10 | 0 |
| h. Room illumination | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| i. Inability to see more than one page at once | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| j. Randomness of order | 7 | 4 | 5 |

14. Did using the microfiche readings make completing your minimum assignments:

9 Easier  6 No Difference  3 Harder

15. Do you feel you read:

5 More  11 The Same  2 Fewer

readings using the microfiche than if you had used reserve or library copies?

16. If all your class readings were available on fiche, would your reading:

2 Increase 12 Stay Same 4 Decrease

17. Of the assigned readings, estimate the percent of articles you:

a. Viewed once

___ 10% ___ 20% 1 40% 5 50% 4 80% 8 90%

b. Read thoroughly

___ 10% ___ 20% 4 40% 9 50% 5 80% 0 90%

18. If you had a personal reader available, how do you expect your response would be to the above questions:

14. 17 Easier 1 No Difference 0 Harder

15. 12 More 7 The Same 0 Fewer

16. 8 Increase 9 Stay Same 0 Decrease

17a. ___10% ___20% 1 40% 2 60% 4 80% 11 90%

17b. ___10% ___20% 2 40% 5 60% 6 80% 5 90%

19. General comments on benefits

20. General comments on problems

# APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARIANSHIP

GREENSHEET
LIB. 200 - Foundations of Librarianship

I. DESCRIPTION

A study of the place of libraries and librarianship in society, emphasizing the functions and services of libraries. Provides an overview of the modern library from the standpoint of its objectives, types, organization, literature, heritage and trends. Three units.

II. OBJECTIVES

A. General:

To acquire a fundamental understanding and appreciation of the profession and practice of librarianship, general and specialized.

B. Specific:

1) to explore aspects of the profession of librarianship

2) to describe and identify functions of libraries

3) to investigate some problems affecting libraries

4) to study trends in librarianship with a glance at the future

III. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

A. Assigned readings covering the topics listed in the outline.

B. Participation in class discussions.

C. Preparation of a term report, or equivalent, exploring in depth one of the areas of current interest in librarianship.

D. Class attendance and satisfactory performance on all examinations.

IV. TEXTS

Required:

Butler, Pierce. AN INTRODUCTION TO LIBRARY SCIENCE. University of Chicago Press, 1933 (Phoenix, 1961).

Recommended:

Gates, Jean. INTRODUCTION TO LIBRARIANSHIP. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, 1968.

SYLLABUS
LIB. 200

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Librarianship as a profession
B. The literature of librarianship

II. FUNCTIONS OF LIBRARIES

A. Acquisition
B. Organization of material
C. Dissemination of information

III. TYPES OF LIBRARIES

A. Public
B. School
C. Academic
D. Special
E. Federal

IV. NETWORKS

A. Library
B. Information

V. COMPUTER AND THE LIBRARY

A. Library automation
B. Information retrieval

VI. LIBRARY AND SOCIETY

A. Copyright
B. Intellectual freedom
C. Library as a social agency

VII. WORKSHOP ON JOB EXPECTANCIES

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

I. READINGS

A. Pierce Butler, due at mid-term
B. All citations on attached bibliography

II. TESTING

A. Mid-term
B. Final

III. OTHER ASSIGNMENTS

A. Participation in class discussion based on readings
B. Examination of professional literature
C. Participation in a panel discussion dealing with one of the major types of libraries
D. Critique of a library research project

BIBLIOGRAPHY
LIB. 200

I. Introduction: Librarianship as a Profession

Asheim, Lester E. Education and Manpower for Librarianship. ALA BULLETIN 62:1096-1118, October 1968. Fiche 13 C7

Library Education and Manpower: ALA Policy Proposal. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 1:341-344, April 1970. Not on fiche.

Asheim, Lester E. "New Trends in the Curriculum of Library Schools", in Goldhor, Herbert. EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP: THE DESIGN OF THE CURRICULUM IN LIBRARY SCHOOLS. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1971. pp. 59-79. Fiche 6 G12.

Boissonnas, Christian. ALA and Professionalism: Heading in the Right Direction? AMERICAN LIBRARIES 3:972-979, October 1972. Fiche 11 A9.

Professional Standards of Living. (Comment by J. M. Ray) AMERICAN LIBRARIES 4:74, February 1973. Fiche 9 G1.

Bundy, Mary Lee and Wasserman, Paul. Professionalism Reconsidered. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 29:5-26, January 1968. Fiche 13 A14. (last page is in frame C8)

Fetros, John G. The Search for a Code of Ethics. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 2:743-746, July-August 1971. Fiche 12 F9.

Goode, William. "Professions and Non-Professions", in Vollmer, Howard M. and Donald L. Mills, eds. PROFESSIONALIZATION. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966. pp. 33-43. Fiche 12 F13.

Mleynek, Darryl. Professional Unions. CALIFORNIA LIBRARIAN 31:110-118. April 1970. Fiche 9 D13.

Sayers, Frances Clark. "The Belligerent Profession", in SUMMONED BY BOOKS. New York: Viking Press, 1965. pp. 27037. Fiche 7 F 4.

White, Herbert S. Toward Professionalism. SPECIAL LIBRARIES 60:69-73, February 1969. Fiche 9 H10.

II. Functions of Libraries

Library Services for the Nation's Needs. The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. LIBRARIES AT LARGE. Bowker, 1969. pp. 495-521. Fiche 2 A12.

A. Acquisitions

Dougherty, R. M. and Maier, J. M. CENTRALIZED PROCESSING FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES. Scarecrow, 1971. pp. 111-121. Fiche 1 A 12.

Leonard, Lawrence E. Colorado Libraries Book Processing Center: A Feasibility Study. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 29:393-399, September 1968. Fiche 11 E4.

Morrison, P. D. and others. Symposium on approval order plans and the book selection responsibilities of the librarians. LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES 12:133-145. Spring 1968. Fiche 14 B 7.

Thompson, L. S. Acquisition of Books and Pamphlets. LIBRARY TRENDS 19:280-293, January 1970. Fiche 7 G1.

Wulfekoetter, Gertrude. ACQUISITION WORK. University of Washington Press, 1961. pp. 3-19. Fiche 6 F8.

B. Organization of Material

Dawson, J. M. The Library of Congress: Its Role in Cooperative and Centralized Cataloging. LIBRARY TRENDS 16:85-96, July 1967. Fiche 12 C5.

Dunkin, Paul S. Cataloging and Classification - the Big If. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 3:775-783, July-August 1972. Fiche 10 G6.

Orne, Jerrold. Standards in Library Technology. LIBRARY TRENDS 21:286-297, October 1972. Fiche 8 C13.

Shera, Jesse. "Classification as the Basis of Bibliographic Organization", in LIBRARIES AND THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE. Archon, 1965. pp. 77-96. Fiche 6 B4.

C. Dissemination of Information

Blakely, Florence. Perceiving Patterns of Reference Service: A Survey. RQ 11:30-38, Fall 1971. Fiche 9 D3

Buddington, William S. "Access to Information", in ADVANCES IN LIBRARIANSHIP. New York: Academic Press, 1971. vol. II, pp. 1-43. Fiche 3 B6.

Carter, Mary D. and Wallace J. Bonk. "Principles of Book Selection", in BUILDING LIBRARY COLLECTIONS. 2nd ed. New York: Scarecrow Press, 1964. pp. 12-46. Fiche 5 F11.

Christ, John M. "Ideas of Library Function", in TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATIONAL LIBRARIANSHIP. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1972. pp. 29-37. Fiche 5 E6.

McGee, R. S. Kay Factors of Circulation System Analysis and Design. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 33:127-139, March 1972. Fiche 9 F2.

Shores, Louis. "Introduction: the Practice of Reference", in BASIC REFERENCE SOURCES: AN INTRODUCTION TO MATERIALS AND METHODS. Chicago: ALA, 1954. pp. 1-22. Fiche 4 B4

Vagianos, Louis. What Rough Beast A-Borning? Educational Egalitarianism: Lost Cause? LIBRARY JOURNAL 98:1873-1879, June 15, 1973. Fiche 11 B4.

III. Types of Libraries

A. Public Libraries

Blasingame, Ralph. "Effectiveness in Cooperation and Consolidation in Public Libraries", in ADVANCES IN LIBRARIANSHIP. New York: Academic Press, 1970. Vol. I, pp. 189-206. Fiche 2 D8.

Epstein, Jacob S. History of Urban Main Library Service. LIBRARY TRENDS 20:598-625, April 1972. Fiche 8 A13.

Lipsman, Claire K. "Public Library Service to the Urban Disadvantaged", in Conant, Ralph W. and Kathleen Molz. THE METROPOLITAN LIBRARY. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1972. pp. 187-209. Fiche 6 D12.

Martin, Allie Beth. "The Public Library, 1950-1970", in A STRATEGY FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY CHANGE. Chicago: ALA, 1972. pp. 11-19. Fiche 13 F9.

Martin, Allie Beth. "The Public Library Today", in A STRATEGY FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY CHANGE. Chicago: ALA, 1972. pp. 20-21. Fiche 13 G4.

Wheeler, Joseph L. and Herbert Goldhor. "Objectives and Functions of the Public Library", in PRACTICAL ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LIBRARIES. New York: Harper and Row, 1962. pp. 3-22. Fiche 5 C12.

B. School Libraries

Beggs, Davis W. III. "Storehouse and Laboratory", in INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA CENTER; BOLD NEW VENTURE, ed. by Harold S. Davis. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1971. pp. 2-11. Fiche 2 C11.

Cox, Carl T. A Total System View of the School Library. SCHOOL MEDIA QUARTERLY 1:36-40, Fall 1972. Fiche 9 A11.

Crawford, Lura E. The Changing Nature of School Library Collections. LIBRARY TRENDS 17:383-400, April 1969. Fiche 12 G10.

Darling, R. L. Two Decisive Decades: School Libraries and Curriculum Reform. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 3:753-757, July 1972. Fiche 10 F2.

Pearson, Neville P. and Lucius A. Butler. "Concept and Theory", in LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS: SELECTED READINGS. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company, 1973. pp. 3-39. Fiche 8 D12.

C. Academic Libraries

Holley, Edward C. Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 33:175-189, May 1972. Fiche 9 C2.

Leimkuhler, Ferdinand and Anthony E. Neville. The Uncertain Future of the Library. WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 43:30-38, September 1968. Fiche 14 A11.

Mason, Ellsworth. Along the Academic Way. LIBRARY JOURNAL 96:1671-1676, May 15, 1971. Fiche 10 D4.

Shores, Louis. The Library College Idea. LIBRARY JOURNAL 91:3871-75, September 1, 1966. Fiche 12 B13.

Smith, Eldred. Academic Status for College and University Librarians - Problems and Prospects. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 31:7-13, January 1970. Fiche 11 D8.

Wilson, L. R. and Tauber, M. F. THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY. 2nd ed. Columbia University Press, 1956. pp. 12-27. Fiche 3 G8 (Starts over again on Fiche 4 A2).

D. Special Libraries

Anders, M. E. Reference Service in Special Libraries. LIBRARY TRENDS 12:390-404, January 1964. Fiche 12 A9.

Objectives and Standards for Special Libraries. SPECIAL LIBRARIES 55:671-680, December 1964. Fiche 11 B12.

Strauss, L. J. Shreve, I. M. and Brown, A. L. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL LIBRARIES. 2nd ed. Wiley/Becker-Hayes, 1972. pp. 1-35. Fiche 2 F12.

Woods, Bill M. The Special Library Concept of Service. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 3:759-768, July-August 1972. Fiche 10 F8.

E. Governmental Libraries

Beasley, Kenneth E. "The Changing Role of the State Library", in ADVANCES IN LIBRARIANSHIP. New York: Academic Press, 1971. Vol. II, pp. 187-213. Fiche 3 E8.

Greenaway, Emerson, et. al. "Libraries Look to the State Agency", AMERICAN LIBRARIES 2:735-742, July-August 1971. Fiche 11 G2.

Leach R. D. "A Broad Look at the Federal Government and Libraries", in LIBRARIES AT LARGE. Bowker, 1969. pp. 346-386. Fiche 1 E11.

IV. Networks

A. Library Networks

The California Library Network, A Master Plan. CLA NEWSLETTER 13:1-17, December 1971. Fiche 10 D11.

Coenenberg, Richard. Synergizing Reference Service in the San Francisco Bay Region. ALA BULLETIN 62:1379-1384, December 1968. Fiche 13 F3.

Olson, E. E., Shank, R. and Olsen, H. A. "Library and Information Networks", in ANNUAL REVIEW OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. American Society for Information Science, 1972. Vol. 7, pp. 279-321. Fiche 14 D2.

B. Information Networks

Avram, H. D. and Pulsifer, J. S. "Bibliographic Services for a National Network", in INTERLIBRARY COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION NETWORKS, ed. by J. Becker. Chicago: ALA, 1971. pp. 92-100. Fiche 1 A1.

Overhage, Carl F. J. "Information Networks", in ANNUAL REVIEW OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. Encyclopedia Britannica, 1969. Vol. 4, pp. 339-378. Fiche 4 C14.

Parker, E. B. and Dunn, D. A. Information Technology: Its Social Potential. SCIENCE 176:1392-1398, June 30, 1972. Fiche 14 A6. (last page is in frame A12).

V. Computers and the Library

A. The Library and Automation

Chapman, Edward A., St. Pierre, Paul L., and Lubans, John Jr. LIBRARY SYSTEMS ANALYSIS GUIDELINES. Wiley, 1970. pp. 7-16. Fiche 2 E14.

Cox, N. S. M., Dews, J. D., and Dolby, J. L. THE COMPUTER AND THE LIBRARY. Archon, 1967. pp. 14-26. Fiche 8 G11.

INFORMATION ON THE MARC SYSTEM. 3rd ed. Library of Congress, 1973. pp. 1-10. Fiche 10 C6.

Markuson, Barbara. Overview of Library Systems and Automation. DATAMATION 16:60-68, February 1970. Fiche 13 G10.

Shera, Jesse H. Documentation Into Information Science. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 3:785-790, July-August, 1972. Fiche 11 A2.

Sherman, Don. "Converting Bibliographic Data to Machine Form", in ADVANCES IN LIBRARIANSHIP. New York: Academic Press, 1972. Vol. III, pp. 221-243. Fiche 13 D3.

Veaner, Allen B. Major Decision Points in Library Automation. COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES 31:299-312, September 1970. Fiche 13 E3.

B. Information Retrieval

Gechman, M. C. "Machine-readable Bibliographic Data Bases", in ANNUAL REVIEW OF INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. American Society for Information Science, 1972. Vol. 7, pp. 323-378. Fiche 4 F12.

Lancaster, F. W. INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS. Wiley, 1968. pp. 1-53. Fiche 7 B6.

Warheit, I. A. File Organization of Library Records. JOURNAL OF LIBRARY AUTOMATION 2:20-30, March 1969. Fiche 12 E12

VI. The Library and Society

A. Copyright

Clapp, Verner, W. "Copyright-A Librarian's View", in LIBRARIES AT LARGE. Bowker, 1969. pp. 242-263. Fiche 1 D3.

Kim, C. Librarians and Copyright Legislation: the Historical Background. AMERICAN LIBRARIES 2:615-622, June 1971. Fiche 12 A1.

B. Intellectual Freedom

Asheim, Lester. Not Censorship but Selection. WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 28:63-67, September 1953. Fiche 11 G10.

Barnes, Clive. "Special Introduction", in REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY. New York: Bantam Books, 1970. pp. ix-xvii. Fiche 5 F2.

Berninghausen, David. Antithesis in Librarianship: Social Responsibilities vs. the Library Bill of Rights. LIBRARY JOURNAL 97:3775-3681, November 15, 1972. Fiche 9 G4.

Social Responsibility and the Library Bill of Rights - The Berninghausen Debate. LIBRARY JOURNAL 98:25-41, January 1, 1973. Fiche 9 G12.

California Library Association. California Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee Handbook of Procedures. CLA NEWSLETTER 13:entire issue, February 1971. Fiche 10 B1.

Downs, Robert B. Freedom of Speech and Press: Development of a Concept. LIBRARY TRENDS 19:8-18, July 1970. Fiche 8 A1.

Sayers, Frances Clark. If the Trumpet Be Not Sounded. WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 40:659-662, April 1965. Fiche 12 B10. (p. 662 is in frame B14).

C. The Library as a Social Agency

Lacy, Dan. "Social Change and the Library: 1945-1980", in LIBRARIES AT LARGE. Bowker, 1969. pp. 3-22. Fiche 1 B10.

Landheer, B. "What is 'the Social Function' of a Library?" in SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF LIBRARIES. Scarecrow Press, 1957. pp. 1-13. Fiche 6 C12.

When is a Social Issue a Library Issue? - A Symposium. WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 45:43-61, September 1970. Fiche 11 E11.

VII. Job Expectancies

Myers, Margaret. Emergency First Aid: A Guide for Library Job Hunters. WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN 48:660-670, April 1973. Fiche 9 B3.

APPENDIX C

California State University, San Jose
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95192

LIBRARIANSHIP DEPARTMENT

Dear Sir:

The Department of Librarianship is involved in an on-going series of projects dealing with innovative methods of instruction. One of these is a joint Faculty-Student Research Project to determine the feasibility of using locally created microfiche to deal with student requirements for course-required "outside readings". This method of satisfying student needs is being explored as an alternative to the traditional method of placing the materials in the Reserve Book Room.

These microfiche readings are to be used on an experimental basis in the introductory survey course "Foundations of Librarianship" in the Fall, 1973 semester. Required and suggested materials will be microfilmed and distributed only to a select group of students together with a course syllabus. Testing and individual evaluation will be employed to determine the acceptability and effectiveness of this use of technology.

As project directory, I would like to request permission to microfilm the enclosed list of material for which you hold copyright.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Martha W. West
Assistant Professor

MWW:bcm

Enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS SEATTLE WASHINGTON 98195

August 27, 1973

Professor Martha W. West
Librarianship Department
California State University - San Jose
San Jose, California 95192

Dear Professor West:

Thank you for your recent letter inquiring about permission to use material from our book, ACQUISITION WORK, by Gertrude Wulfekoetter, in your proposed survey course.

This sounds like an intriguing subject, and we would be more than willing to help with the research. Instead of a fee, we would like to have a report on the progress of this project. Such information could be very valuable to use in the future.

Good luck to you.

Sincerely yours,

Juanita B. Pike

(Mrs.) Juanita B. Pike
Rights and Permissions

Burgess

September 4, 1973

Martha W. West
Librarianship Department
California State University
San Jose, California 95192

Dear Professor West:

Thank you for your recent letter requesting permission to reproduce on microfilm pages 3-39 of Section One: Concept and Theory from LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS: SELECTED READINGS, 1973, by Pearson, Neville P. and Lucius A. Butler, to be used in the introductory survey course, "Foundations of Librarianship" at your school during the fall, 1973 semester.

Permission is hereby granted for your use of this material as specified. We would appreciate your acknowledgment of the source of your information by indicating authors, title, year of publication, and publisher. Also, please forward us a copy of the reproduction and a syllabus when this project is completed so we may place them on file.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in our publication and extend our best wishes for the success of your microfiche readings - it is certainly a new approach and its possibilities should be unlimited.

We look forward to receiving the material with interest.

Sincerely,

Kay Kushino

(Mrs.) Kay Kushino
Rights and Permissions

Burgess Publishing Company 7108 OHMS LANE • MINNEAPOLIS MINN. 55435 • (612) 831-1344

Wilson *Library* Bulletin 950 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, BRONX, NEW YORK 10452, Tel. 212-588-8400

September 10, 1973

Martha W. West
Assistant Professor
California State University
San Jose, California 95192

Dear Professor West:

Permission is hereby granted to microfilm materials appearing in WLB and cited in your request received here August 9, 1973. This permission is given only with the understanding that the microfilm is for one-time classroom use, and that permission will again be requested for any further use or reproduction.

All the best wishes on your project, which sounds like a good idea. I can still remember all the struggles over materials on reserve.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Plotnik
Associate Editor

AP:cp

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC., PUBLISHERS
605 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 212 TN 7-9800 CABLE: JONWILE

October 10, 1973

Professor Martha W. West
Librarianship Department
California State University, San Jose
San Jose, California 95192

Dear Professor West:

Thank you for your letter of September 27 concerning your request for permission to reproduce the following material from our books on Microfiche, for use in a pilot project with 25 students:

Chapman et al, LIBRARY SYSTEMS ANALYSIS GUIDELINES (pp. 7-16)
Lancaster, INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS (pp. 1-53)
Strauss et al, SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL LIBRARIES, 2nd ed. (pp. 1-35)

We certainly are in favor of experimentation with new ways of making the printed word available. In order to make it possible for you to conduct this pilot project, we are willing to waive our usual fee. This is with the understanding, however, that we are making an exception to our usual procedures. In fairness to our authors you should keep in mind when you evaluate the results of the experiment that future use of our material in this way would involve a permission fee.

Appropriate credit to our publications should appear on every copy. The following components should be included: Title, author(s), Copyright © (date and owner). Reproduced by permission of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

This permission is limited to the period ending December 31, 1974 or the end of the semester during which the project is conducted, whichever is sooner. At the end of the project, please send us a report of the number of uses of our mater ls. We also would appreciate receiving a copy of the report of your study.

Sincerely,

Joan K. Lince

Joan K. Lince
Permissions Manager

/jkl

(201) 548-8600

THE SCARECROW PRESS, INC.

52 Liberty Street, P.O. BOX 656 · Metuchen, N.J. 08840

August 15, 1973

Martha W. West
Assistant Professor
California State University
Librarianship Department
San Jose, Calif. 95192

Dear Ms. West:

I'm responding to your letter regarding the use of some of our books on a microfiche project.

Inasmuch as this is experimental we are willing to participate in this program on a somewhat restricted level. Specifically, we would be willing to allow you to use the Landheer SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF LIBRARIES in your program but we will at this time not permit the use of the Carter & Bonk or the Dougherty books. The reasons, of course, for this are rather obvious but specifically these are both books that we rely very heavily on textbook adoptions and sales and we are not in a position to have these used in this kind of a program. As a matter of fact the very existence of these books depends on textbook adoptions and sales.

Further to this plan, we would like to hear from you regarding how you plan to compensate the author and the publisher for use of copyrighted materials in your program. As you are probably aware a program similar to what you are working out now was put in effect somewhere in Africa (I'm not exactly sure where at this time but if need be I can probably dig it out). This program required the use of microfiche as does yours, but it also made arrangements for royalty payments for each use of the microfiche when it was used by a student. How do you plan to compensate? How do you plan to control the use so that proper credits will be given? We of course would be very interested in hearing from you regarding these questions and also if you are interested in using the Landheer book.

Sincerely,

Albert W. Daub
Vice President

AWD/hp

per telephone conversation 8/28/73 ww

ARCHON BOOKS

The Shoe String Press, Inc. 995 Sherman Avenue • Hamden • Connecticut 06514
203 • 248-6307 • Cable address: Archon

September 4, 1973

Martha West
Assistant Professor, Librarianship Department
California State University, San Jose
San Jose, California 95192

Dear Professor West:

Your letter of August 27th concerning the project for distributing mocrofiche using materials from Cox: THE COMPUTER AND THE LIBRARY and Shera: LIBRARIES AND THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE has been received. We note that your request is for one-time use, and yet I am sure that you are just as aware as we are that once the microfiche has been made it would be available for future use.

Furthermore, the project was funded, even though at a small amount. It is disturbing to us to note that the project directors evidently considered the copyright material not worth funding, but that the purchase of readers was necessary. Why did not the reader manufacturers give these readers for the project in anticipation of future sales?

As you can see, there is a principle involved, and I do believe that the authors and publishers must both be protected by upholding that principle. We will, under the conditions, reduce our fee for this one time only to $10.00 per title involved, thus making a total fee of $20.00 if both the readings from Cox's THE COMPUTER AND THE LIBRARY and Shera's LIBRARIES AND THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE are used. We submit herewith a letter copy for your signature if you decide to use the materials and accept this reduced fee required.

Sincerely yours,

Frances T. Rutter

(Mrs.) Frances T. Rutter

FTR:EJ:SS